

IN THE HIGH COURT OF GUJARAT AT AHMEDABAD

SPECIAL CIVIL APPLICATION No 755 of 1993

For Approval and Signature:

Hon'ble MR.JUSTICE M.S.SHAH

=====

1. Whether Reporters of Local Papers may be allowed to see the judgements? : NO
2. To be referred to the Reporter or not? : NO
3. Whether Their Lordships wish to see the fair copy of the judgement? : NO
4. Whether this case involves a substantial question of law as to the interpretation of the Constitution of India, 1950 of any Order made thereunder? : NO
5. Whether it is to be circulated to the Civil Judge? : NO

-----  
SANKARBHAI ALIAS DAHYABHAI PRABHUBHAI

Versus

COMPETENT AUTHORITY & DEPUTY COLLECTOR

-----  
Appearance:

MRS KETTY A MEHTA for Petitioners

Ms MANISHA LAVKUMAR, AGP for Respondent No. 1, 2

-----  
CORAM : MR.JUSTICE M.S.SHAH

Date of decision: 20/07/1999

ORAL JUDGEMENT

Heard Mrs Ketty Mehta, learned counsel for the petitioners and Ms Manisha Lavkumar, learned AGP for the respondents.

2. In this petition, the petitioners have challenged the order passed by the State Government under Section 34 of the Urban Land (Ceiling & Regulation) Act, 1976 and the further proceedings before the Competent Authority pursuant to the aforesaid impugned or the State

Government. The authorities have not taken over possession of the land in question from the petitioners, which fact is not in dispute in view of the instructions contained in the letter No. KS/30/SCA/General/99/V-4, dated 23.6.1999 from the Section Officer, Revenue Department, Government of Gujarat to the Government Pleader.

3. The Urban Land (Ceiling & Regulation) Act, 1976 has been repealed by the Urban Land (Ceiling & Regulation) Repeal Act, 1999, as adopted by the Gujarat State Legislative Assembly as per the resolution dated 30th March, 1999, passed under Article 252 (2) of the Constitution. In view of the provisions of the aforesaid Repeal Act, 1999, the orders impugned in the present petition do not survive and all the proceedings under the Urban Land (Ceiling & Regulation) Act, 1976 in respect of the land in question as well as the present petition have abated.

4. The petition is accordingly disposed of as having abated. There shall be no order as to costs.

July 20, 1999 (M.S. Shah, J.)

sundar/-